THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
ROUND TABLE

ERTY OF THE
RARY OF THE
AY 12 1942
OMAN'S COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

POLITICS IN WARTIME

With Complete Voting Record of Senators and Representatives on Important Foreign and Domestic Issues

D
410
U7
no. 216-218

A Radio Discussion by

- JOHN EBERHART
- RICHARD McKEON
- PETER ODEGARD

428th BROADCAST IN COOPERATION WITH THE NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY · 216

MAY 3, 1942

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ROUND TABLE

REG. U.S. PAT. OFF.

Published weekly. 10 cents a copy; five copies, 25 cents; full-year subscription, 52 issues, two dollars. Published by the University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. Entered as second-class matter January 3, 1939, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

No. 216

NOTE

The supplementary information contained in the footnotes to the following text, developed by staff research, is not to be considered as representing the opinions of the ROUND TABLE *speakers. Following the transcript of the broadcast are questions which readers may wish to use for analysis and discussion. It is hoped that teachers and discussion leaders may find this additional service of the* ROUND TABLE *transcript helpful in their study of the subject discussed in the broadcast.*

POLITICS IN WARTIME

A UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO ROUND TABLE BROADCAST*

•

JOHN EBERHART, Department of Psychology, Northwestern University

RICHARD P. MCKEON, Dean of the Division of the Humanities, University of Chicago

PETER ODEGARD, Department of Political Science, Amherst College

* A radio discussion broadcast from the University of Chicago, over the Red Network of the National Broadcasting Company, Sunday, May 3, 1942, at 1:30 P.M., Central War Time.

The ROUND TABLE, oldest educational program continuously on the air, is broadcast entirely without a script, although participants meet in advance, prepare a topical outline, and exchange data and views. Subjects are chosen because of their social, political, or economic significance. The program has no "ax to grind." In the selection of speakers, the effort is to provide a balanced discussion by participants who have special competence and knowledge. The opinion of each speaker is his own and in no way involves the responsibility of either the University of Chicago or the National Broadcasting Company.

POLITICS IN WARTIME

•

This is an election year. In primary elections one state after another is selecting candidates for election to Congress. Candidates are either defending their records or attacking the records of their opponents. Political party organizations are rallying behind their candidates, and the people are searching for guidance as they select their representatives in the first wartime congressional election in a quarter of a century.

Should there be a moratorium on politics in wartime? What are the party platforms and programs? How are voters to judge the merits of the candidates? Where does politics end and government begin? What is the role of politics in wartime?

To answer these and other questions, the University of Chicago ROUND TABLE *invited three expert observers to its microphone to discuss a topic which is of importance to every voting American: "Politics in Wartime."*

•

MR. MCKEON: Between now and November, American citizens will go to the primaries to select the candidates for the election in November of four hundred and thirty-five congressmen, thirty-four senators, and thirty-four governors. This is a wartime election. The responsibilities are very grave, and the issues are stated in rather ambiguous terms.

Odegard, you're an expert in political science. What do you think of the presentation of the issues upon which American citizens will vote during this election?

MR. ODEGARD: Of course, the party that is going to carry the offensive in this election is the Republican party, and the case they are going to make against the Democratic party has already been made—at least in its broad outlines. That case is briefly this: The Democratic party has used its position in the administration to intrench itself in power. It has used its power to promote its social objectives at the expense of the prosecution of the war. It has promoted Democratic partisan interests at the

expense of national interests, and it has demonstrated its incapacity to carry on the war as efficiently as it should.

MR. EBERHART: The contrary variety of criticism has been expressed before now and is being expressed again by the Democrats about the Republicans and their critical approach to the war. The Democrats have been saying, and will continue to say, that the Republicans are using the war only for obstructionist purposes; that they are attempting by every means, fair and foul, to win the election in the fall, even if that impedes the war effort.

MR. MCKEON: This is a sufficiently confused statement of the issues. In my own reading of the press it seems to me to be confused further by the suggestion that is made frequently (usually in the form of a suspicion that is darkly hinted) that there will be no elections; that the democratic system, the two-party political system of this country, and all modes of election are disappearing before a form of dictatorial control. What do you think of that as a statement?

MR. ODEGARD: That suggestion has been made time and again. In every time of emergency or crisis you find some crackpot rising to suggest that we abandon elections and do away with our democratic system.

MR. EBERHART: Isn't it true that this suspicion or this claim has always been voiced by the party which is not in power?

MR. ODEGARD: Yes. It's used as a device in the election itself and in the campaign. In this connection I like to think of the democratic system of government as meaning something more than just the alternation of debate and discussion and controversy over jobs. Bernard Shaw once said that "democracy is a system of government under which the people have a right to prevent themselves from being governed better than they want to be governed."

MR. MCKEON: We seem to be agreed, then, that the statements of issues are not clear, and consequently, since we're engaged in talking about "Politics in Wartime," it might be a good idea to be clear concerning what is meant by politics.

In ordinary usage the word "politics" has two senses, a good and a bad one; and to be sure of this distinction I looked it up in the dictionary before this broadcast. Politics is defined, first, as "the theory or practice of managing or directing the affairs of public policy or of political parties . . . . "; and the second definition is the "artful or dishonest management to secure the success of political candidates or parties." I don't think it's possible to separate those two definitions, and yet the issues are involved in those two.

447248

Mr. Eberhart: Those are rather "loaded" definitions, since one obviously is the bad kind of politics, which we cannot put up with in wartime, and the other is the good kind of politics, that is absolutely essential to the conduct of the affairs of a democracy in wartime as in peacetime. Now, there are some special conditions which limit the operation of ordinary political activity in wartime. Isn't that true?

Mr. Odegard: Yes, I think there are. This distinction between bad politics and good politics is very much like the distinction between machine politics and organization politics. When a member of a party refers to his own party, it's always "my party" or "our organization" and "our leaders." But when he refers to members of the opposition, it's always to the "opposition machine" and to the "opposition bosses."

Mr. McKeon: Or, even more simply, machine politics is usually the politics of your opponent, and the organization politics is your own. We've got to get away from that manner of distinguishing the two.

Mr. Odegard: That's it precisely. The distinction is a vague and abstract one, so long as it deals with the motivations of people rather than with what they actually do.

Mr. McKeon: Now, if we're to be practical, let's not be satisfied with merely saying "good politics" and "bad politics." Let's grant that we've got to have political devices, good or bad. The important problem is to be able to be specific about what are the good political devices.

How do we, in time of war, differentiate the two? What new problems does war introduce?

Mr. Eberhart: The new problems arise from the fact that this is a *total* war. This war is somewhat different from the last in that this war is being fought not only on the military front but on the economic front, on the political front, and on the psychological front. And the importance of national unity and a coherent body of public opinion behind the war effort is extraordinarily important for the successful conduct of the war.

Mr. Odegard: Yes, and I'd like to add a footnote to that. The other day the Secretary of the Treasury made a statement which seems to me very pointed at this time. He said that "spending as usual" is as dangerous as "business as usual." I'd like to add that, in my judgment, "politics as usual" in time of war is as dangerous as "business as usual" in wartime.

Mr. McKeon: But notice that we're already involved in exactly the kind of differentiation that is so difficult. Unity is important. Does that mean that there is to be no criticism? Criticism is important, but how shall we have criticism that doesn't disrupt national unity? You have,

in other words, two words—"unity" and "criticism"—balancing each other, and the differentiation is difficult. Can we look back at history to see whether there has been a situation like this before?

MR. EBERHART: In 1918, in the mid-term congressional election during Wilson's second administration, Woodrow Wilson asked that the country send back to Congress Democratic representatives as a proof of their approval of his leadership.[1] And, partially as a result of that appeal, the Congress was not a Democratic one but a Republican one.

MR. MCKEON: I take it that would be an example of what we've been calling "bad politics," since, instead of an appeal to the policy that was in the interest of national unity or the ends of the government, the appeal was made to factional interests and party interests.

MR. EBERHART: It could be called bad politics in the sense that it was probably bad judgment on Wilson's part.

MR. ODEGARD: I'd like to point out, in that connection, that if it was a mistake for Wilson in 1918 to appeal for a Democratic Congress in the midst of a war (as I think it was), President Franklin Roosevelt is not making that mistake now. He has declared that he is not going to make a partisan issue of the conduct of the war and has disavowed any intention of appealing to the people in those terms in this election.

MR. MCKEON: We've run into this problem, apparently, in all our great wars. In the Civil War we had not only a congressional election but an election which involved the presidency in 1864, when Lincoln ran against one of the defeated generals; and the issues were almost like the issues today.

MR. EBERHART: Yes. McClellan was the candidate of the Democrats in that election, on a platform which was defeatist, and he came within four hundred thousand votes of beating Lincoln in 1864.

Now, in concluding this first section, it seems to me we have come to the point where we can see that there is good politics, which is necessary for the conduct of the war, and bad politics, which we must do away with as much as possible. We must have the good; we have to get away from the bad; and history shows that politics can be carried on in wartime without necessarily interfering with the war effort.

---

[1] *President Woodrow Wilson on October 24, 1918, appealed to the American voters: "If you have approved of my leadership and wish me to continue to be your unembarrassed spokesman in affairs at home and abroad, I earnestly beg that you will express yourselves unmistakably to that effect by returning a Democratic majority to both the Senate and the House of Representatives."*

MR. MCKEON: There is a second question which should be considered. We're talking about politics in the time of a congressional election. The function of the Congress, it seems to me, is one of the important problems that we ought to consider. What is the function of Congress in wartime?

If I gather the tone of Congress correctly, many of the congressional leaders are beginning to be restive, to feel that the issues upon which Congress should decide are not being turned over to Congress; that in the press of winning the war we're forgetting all the functions that the representatives of the people might exercise. We might find some way of being specific about that.

MR. ODEGARD: Congress is called the representative branch of the government. And yet, as a matter of fact, we ought not to forget that the only representatives of the entire nation, the entire people, under our system are the President and the Vice-President of the United States. Those are the only officials for whom the entire nation votes. And, moreover, under the Constitution the President is charged with direct responsibility for conducting the war and for recommending those policies to the Congress which, in his judgment, are necessary to the successful prosecution of the war.

MR. EBERHART: And the Congress has voluntarily granted these powers to the President, just as they did to President Wilson in World War I. Their principal function, as I see it (and it is a very important function), is to remain constantly critical of the policies proposed to them and constantly critical of the way in which those policies are carried out.

MR. MCKEON: That brings us back to our earlier conflict—criticism versus unity. How shall the Congress criticize the actions of the Administration, particularly if the Administration must, in the interests of time, carry on a complicated campaign on the political, the economic, and the military front?

MR. EBERHART: One simple rule, it seems to me, is the rule that criticisms in Congress, as elsewhere, should be devoted to the attainment of specific objectives; and, if they are so devoted, it will cut out a lot of the present wild criticism which is going on.

MR. MCKEON: I should like to add that concrete criticism should always be based upon specific information, gathered from sources that can be trusted, by means that are in accordance with the laws of evidence.

MR. ODEGARD: I'd like to ask just what the function of good and sound criticism is? And I'd like to answer my own question; that's the reason I asked it.

I'd like to answer it this way: The type of criticism that is legitimate in time of war, such as that of the Truman Committee, for example, on the conduct of the war, would point out weaknesses in the conduct of the war and the administration of the war. It would ferret out incompetent officials. It would help to improve the quality of legislation that is proposed. It would help to increase the efficiency of the operation of the war. That, ideally, is the true function of criticism in time of war.

MR. EBERHART: Your mention of the Truman Committee reminds me of the complaints which a number of congressmen made to me last year, when I was spending some time in Washington, that they simply did not have the information on which to base effective criticism of what was going on. Most of the congressmen with whom I talked told me that they get their information from the newspapers, in the same way that you and I get our information. Consequently, without a special study group such as the Truman Committee, or another committee, adequate information simply is not there.

MR. ODEGARD: I'd like to point out that one of the prime functions of the Congress of the United States, or of any legislative body, is, through its discussion and its debate, to keep the general public informed of what is going on; and, unless the Congress itself is well informed, they become merely blind leaders of the blind.

MR. MCKEON: I think that I should agree with all that both of you have been saying, but it seems to me that we're talking in very general terms. We suggest that Congress shan't criticize with respect to specific issues, that its information should be scrutinized carefully, and that national interest should be put above party interests; but in all these cases the arguments that are presented as criticism, whether we agree with them or not, are always, by the critics at least, supposed to conform to these three criteria. I think that possibly we could be more concrete if we turned to criticism that we don't think is justified.

MR. EBERHART: Let me give you an example. In a debate a couple of months ago in the House of Representatives on an appropriation bill, those who were discussing the bill described the highest leaders of the Civilian Defense Program (including the wife of the Commander-in-Chief) as "communists, as enemies boring from within, as quislings, as incompetent parasites, and as highfalutin ducks."

MR. MCKEON: I wonder if I may generalize? It seems to me that there is a type of criticism under which this example falls which should be avoided by Congress. It's a type of criticism that I should like to call "divisionist criticism"—criticism which is intended to separate race from

race, economic class from economic class; to introduce a rivalry between portions or sections of the country; or even to introduce suspicion and distrust of our allies.

MR. ODEGARD: I think that the type of criticism which is utterly contemptible in time of war is that which impugns the integrity and honesty of the President of the United States; that type of criticism which seeks to sow racial hatred and conflict and to set one class and one group against the other; that type of criticism which charges the President with being a warmonger, such as is consistently indulged in by the *Chicago Tribune;* that type of criticism which seeks to divide the United States from its allies, to denounce Russia or Great Britain, and thus to bring about that disunity in the United Nations which will encompass our defeat.

MR. MCKEON: I should be tempted to add to that list, but you have done such an excellent job and so eloquently that I will pass to a second kind of criticism that seems to me to be dangerous in these times.

We spoke of the importance of information. But information, even when it's accurate, can be "fudged," can be turned in directions; it can be incomplete; or, what is even more important, so many branches of the government, so many sections or committees of Congress, can seek the information that, on the one hand, it interferes with the prosecution of the war, that it interferes with the time and energy of Marshall, Nelson, and all of our important administrators, and, on the other hand, that it raises questions, discontents, dissatisfactions, and confusions among the citizens.

MR. EBERHART: There have been several prominent students of the question who urge that the two committees on military affairs (one in the House and one in the Senate), the two naval affairs committees (one in the House and one in the Senate), and the special investigating committees of both House and Senate arrive at some kind of unified organization, which would save the time of these important leaders of the war effort and thereby assist in the conduct of the war effort.

MR. ODEGARD: I'd like to return for just a minute to the problem of divisionist criticism, because, as I see the issue of this campaign, there is going to be an accumulation and a coming-together of all the appeasement forces of the country; of all those people who have been sedulously promoting their private and sectional and limited interests above those of the nation. Such as, for example, if you must be specific, the type of criticism that is indulged in by Representative Dies of Texas and by Mr. Cox and by people of that group, who seem to give the impression that anyone who, for example, contributed to a Japanese boycott movement before the war

is un-American and therefore a communist. And this type of criticism—what we might call "guilt by association" criticism—tends to undermine the confidence of the American people in their government and in its management of the war, which is vitally necessary to its successful prosecution.

MR. MCKEON: We could make a long list, I think, of the criticisms that should be avoided—taboo criticisms: the divisionist criticisms; the criticisms that are based upon partial or misleading information; the criticisms in which the national interest is disguised in such a way as to bring party interest behind the flag to the fore of the discussion; or, finally, the strange statements, the innuendos, the specious arguments that so frequently appear in the statements of our political figures.

But it seems to me that we can be very specific about a problem with which all citizens are concerned today—how shall the voter go to the polls and evaluate the candidates whose claims for nomination and (eventually) election are set up? It seems to me that he must go through a vast amount of statements of this kind—statements in which the issues are not clearly defined.

MR. EBERHART: One thing of which the voter can be sure is that every candidate who faces him in the primary or in the election is going to assert his patriotism, his support of the war effort, his belief in the justice of our cause, and so on. And the voter is going to have to look behind those statements to the record of the candidate who is attempting to get his vote, to the groups which are sponsoring this candidate, and so on, before he can make up his mind how to vote.

MR. ODEGARD: I'd like to suggest that, while all candidates will probably come out very vigorously in support of the flag, in support of the home and mother, and in support of the Constitution, it's vitally necessary, if the voters are to cast their ballots intelligently, that we get something more, that we ask them for a bill of particulars.

For example, they are all ready to talk about economy. Everybody is interested in economy, but we ought to ask them for particular instances of where they would begin to cut. Everybody is for economy in general, it seems, and no politician is in favor of economy in particular.

MR. MCKEON: There is a second phenomenon that I think is equally startling. Not only have all the candidates become cooperative and patriotic, but they have all become experts. They have become military experts, advising about the conduct of the war; they have become economic experts, advising about the shortages of materials and the bottlenecks of production. I think the only check that we have is to go to the record

to find out how they've gotten their information; how accurate it is; and how much use they made of it before.

MR. ODEGARD: Since the supreme issue at this time is the conduct of the war, I'd like to suggest a formula by which the American voters can decide whom they should return in November. I take this from the National League of Women Voters, and it seems to me so good that I'd like to read it, if I may.

MR. MCKEON: Go right ahead.

MR. ODEGARD: "We want men whose first interest is to win the war, regardless of political, sectional, or special interest, and who will recognize that there can be no compromise with fascism; men who know fascism at home when they see it, and have proved their devotion to a democratic solution of the problems they face; and men who have demonstrated their understanding of the part this country must play in an interdependent world and of the responsibility of the United States to share in building a free and stable order, which eventually will include all peoples, regardless of race, religion, or political persuasion."

That seems to me to constitute a fairly good general statement of how you may distinguish the wheat from the chaff in this momentous year, 1942.

MR. MCKEON: I don't think it is possible to go into the whole question of the voting records of our senators and representatives, but the transcript of this broadcast includes a statement of the record of all senators and all representatives on the major bills that have been considered in the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh congresses. We can, therefore, I think, give up the specific questions, except for two negative remarks. It seems to me unfortunate that so much of the criticism that is directed against officeholders is stated in terms of their motives—what lies behind what they have done. It's more important to find out what they did and what it means. And, similarly, too much name-calling has been indulged in even at this early stage in the campaign.

MR. EBERHART: There are always at least two versions of one's motives—your own version of your motives and my version of your motives—and the two of them seldom agree. The party which is not in power always, in political campaigns, attempts to paint the party in power as notoriously incompetent, as made up of rascals or scoundrels, and that kind of general criticism, which attempts simply to discredit, seems to me completely out of place in wartime.

MR. ODEGARD: I don't think that you need to overlook certain things that are in the record. For example, three of the most important issues

that we have had to face have been the question of the extension of the Selective Service Act, the Lend-Lease Act, and the repeal of the Neutrality Act. On those bills we have a record.

I have before me the voting record of members of Congress. I find that ninety-five members of Congress voted against all three of these measures, and, of these ninety-five, ten were Democrats, one a Farmer-Laborite, and one a Progressive. The rest were Republicans.

MR. MCKEON: I think, also, the record of how men talk is important. I heard some interesting statistics the other night from you, Eberhart.

MR. EBERHART: Yes. I was in Washington last year for about seven months, studying the House of Representatives. As one detail in the study I counted up how many speeches had been made in the House during the previous session of Congress. The members of that session are almost the same as the members of this. It turned out that the seven speakers in the House of Representatives who spoke more often than anyone else were all bitter anti–New Dealers, and their speaking careers are continuing. One of these men made 3 per cent of all the speeches delivered in the House; and the seven together made about 10 per cent of all the speeches delivered by four hundred and thirty-five representatives—and they are bitter anti-Administration people.[2] It seems to me that that group was getting far more than its fair share of complaining-time in Congress.

MR. ODEGARD: We would agree, then, that criticism can play a very important role in time of war, in so far as it helps to inform the public, to improve administration, and to assist in increasing the efficiency of the prosecution of the war.

We are agreed, too, I think, that certain types of criticism ought not to be indulged in at this time—the type of criticism that creates the impression of guilt by association, that undermines confidence in our leadership, that sets one group against the other, and so on.[3]

And I think we're agreed that the primary function of criticism is to inform the electorate rather than to confuse and bewilder it.

MR. MCKEON: That leaves us only a very short time for the third question: What has happened to democracy in wartime? We've talked

---

[2] *According to the study, Representative Robert Rich (R. Pa.) made 3 per cent of all the speeches given in the House during the Seventy-sixth Congress. Other representatives who, with Rich, accounted for 10 per cent of all speeches made were: Clare Hoffman (R. Mich.), John Taber (R. N.Y.), John Schafer (R. Wis.), John Rankin (D. Miss.), Everett Dirksen (R. Ill.), and Hamilton Fish, Jr. (R. N.Y.).*

[3] *See "Divide and Conquer," listed among the Suggested Readings on page 14.*

about Congress, the function of criticism, the prosecution of the war, the relative importance of criticism, and unity; but in the case of a war where efficiency is emphasized, what is the relation between these processes and the carrying-out of the war? You have described the difference between the party and the pressure groups in a book, Odegard.[4]

MR. ODEGARD: In my judgment, political parties under our two-party system play a tremendously important role in promoting national unity. Fortunately for us (and it's a godsend in my judgment), our political parties are not organized along the lines of class interests or religious interests or racial interests. Each party represents a fairly good cross-section of the American people. Sometimes this is referred to as tweedledum and tweedledee, on the ground that there is no difference between the Republican and the Democratic parties.

MR. EBERHART: Well, is there any difference?

MR. ODEGARD: I think there is a difference in emphasis, a difference in general direction. And I, for one, thank God for tweedledum and tweedledee, because the fact that we have this kind of a political structure saves us from the cataclysmic changes of violent revolution.

MR. MCKEON: The war, it seems, tends to emphasize the difference between good and bad politics which we brought up in our opening remarks. The difference between the ideals that the government pursues and that the nation tries to maintain and the realistic view is usually stated in terms of a conviction that a man, when he goes to the election, votes according to the way he feels, according to his inherited prejudices. But we've emphasized the need of prudence and sagacity. One of the French philosophers once said that a people gets no better government than a people deserves. The problem is not whether we shall continue politics in wartime; it is a question of good and bad politics. We must have good politics if we are to win the war and win the peace after the war.

---

[4] *Peter H. Odegard and E. Allen Helms, "American Politics" (New York: Harper & Bros., 1938).*

OBJECTIVE QUESTIONS FOR EXAMINATION

The answers to the following questions may be found in the text of the broadcast, and page references are provided to assist in locating the answers.

*

1. How many senators and governors are to be elected in November? Page 2.
2. What is the case the Republican party will make against the Democratic party? What is the case the Democratic party will make against the Republican party? Pages 2–3.
3. What are the definitions of politics presented by the speakers? In what way are the definitions parallel to the distinction between machine politics and organization politics? Pages 3–4.
4. What attitude toward party politics did Woodrow Wilson take in 1918? How does this compare with the stand taken by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1942? Page 5.
5. What are the wartime responsibilities that the Constitution gives the President? Page 6.
6. What kinds of unjustified criticism are cited by the speakers? Pages 7–9.

QUESTIONS FOR ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The following questions of wider scope, intended for discussion, are suggested by the broadcast, and answers may be found in the literature on the subject listed in the section "Suggested Readings," found on page 14.

*

1. Do you think it would be feasible to ban politics for the duration? Is political activity essential to the conduct of the war?
2. How do you resolve the problem posed by the contradiction between the need for *unity* and the need for *criticism?* Discuss.
3. What is the responsibility of the minority party in wartime? Has the Republican party proved a constructive critic? In what instances have Republican criticisms led to improvements in the conduct of the war effort?

4. Do you think the Democratic party has used the war as an excuse to promote its social objectives? Should the war necessitate a moratorium on social reform and New Deal measures? In what instances have members of the Democratic party been constructive critics of the war effort?

5. What are the effects of wartime party rivalries on national unity? To what degree are political parties responsible for wartime democracy? What should be the relation between political parties and the formulation of war aims?

SUGGESTED READINGS

ANGELL, NORMAN, "The Politics of Attack," *Nation*, May 2, 1942. *A statement of the political necessities of wartime cooperation.*

BLAISDELL, DONALD C., *Government under Pressure*. "Public Affairs Pamphlet," No. 67. New York, 1942.

"The Case against the 77th Congress," *Fortune*, May, 1942. *An analysis of the facts congressmen must explain in their 1942 campaigns.*

"A Congress To Win the War," *New Republic*, May 18, 1942. *A supplement analyzing twenty roll calls of both houses of the present Congress.*

ODEGARD, PETER H., and HELMS, E. ALLEN, *American Politics*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1938. *A comprehensive statement of the functioning of the American party system and pressure groups.*

OFFICE OF FACTS AND FIGURES, *Divide and Conquer*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942. *An exposé of the arguments used by the Axis in its effort to destroy the morale and the national unity of the United States.*

STRAIGHT, MICHAEL, "Danger Signals," *New Republic*, February 23, 1942. *An analysis of congressional and party reaction to military reverses.*

"Wendel Willkie's Plea for a Constructive Republican Party," *United States News*, February 20, 1942. *Advocates that the Republican party use its influence to correct abuses and mistakes.*

SIGNIFICANT ROLL CALLS

Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses

Adapted from a Study by the National League of Women Voters

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Three votes on foreign policy in the Seventy-sixth Congress are included as being an important part of the record for those representatives who were in the Seventy-sixth Congress as well as in the Seventy-seventh. The most important foreign-policy votes in the Seventy-seventh Congress and votes on recurring domestic issues are listed. These votes are presented as indicative of the attitudes of members of Congress on important issues. They should not be regarded as the only base for judging congressmen.

KEY TO SYMBOLS IN ROLL CALLS

N—Voted nay. Y—Voted yea. Nr—Not recorded. P—Noted present. Pf—Paired for. Pa—Paired against. Af—Announced for. Aa—Announced against. Blank space—Not a member when vote was taken.

EXPLANATION OF ROLL CALLS

COLUMN 1.—Vote on retaining the mandatory arms-embargo provisions of the Neutrality Act. This amendment was adopted by the House on June 30, 1939, when the administration bill liberalizing the provisions of the Neutrality Act was being considered. The bill then went to the Senate, where it was not considered until after war broke out in Europe in September, 1939.

COLUMN 2.—Vote on retaining the mandatory arms-embargo provision of the Neutrality Act after the Senate had voted to eliminate the embargo. This action was taken on November 2, 1939, after war broke out in Europe.

COLUMN 3.—Vote on the three-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, February 23, 1940. This vote indicates attitudes toward freer movement of goods among all countries.

COLUMN 4.—Vote on passage of Lend-Lease Act, February 6, 1941.

COLUMN 5.—Vote on bill further liberalizing provisions of the Neutrality Act, November 13, 1941, as passed by the Senate.

COLUMN 6.—Vote on extending military service for a period of eighteen months, August 12, 1941.

COLUMN 7.—Vote on acceptance of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, April 1, 1941. Failure to accept this agreement would have been a blow to friendly relations with other American countries.

COLUMN 8.—Vote on overriding the veto of a defense highway appropriation, August 7, 1941. The bill was vetoed on the ground that it called for an unnecessary expenditure of funds. The President had requested an appropriation for defense highways. The bill as passed carried a general federal aid highway appropriation to be divided among the states in the usual way.

COLUMN 9.—Vote on passage of the Smith Antistrike Bill, December 3, 1941. This bill was opposed by organized labor and has been held in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on the ground that it would delay production rather than speed it.

COLUMN 10.—Vote on passage of the Price Control Bill, November 28, 1941.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Alabama:										
Boykin	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Y	Y	Y
Grant	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr
Steagall	N	N	Pf	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hobbs	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Starnes	Pa	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Jarman	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	N	Y	Y
Manasco					Y	Y		Y	Y	N
Sparkman	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Patrick	Pa	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Arizona:										
Murdock	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y
Arkansas:										
Gathings	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Mills	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ellis	Pa	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cravens		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Nr	Y	Y	N
Terry	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Norrell	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Harris				Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
California:										
Lea	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Englebright	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Nr	Y	Y	Y
Buck	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Nr	Y	Pa
Rolph				N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Welch	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Nr	Y	N	Y
Carter	Y	Y	N	N	N	Nr	N	Y	Y	Y
Tolan	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Nr	Nr
Anderson	Y	N	N	N	Nr	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Gearhart	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Elliott	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Hinshaw	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Pa	Y	Y	N
Voorhis	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Kramer	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	N	Y	Y
Ford, T. F.	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y	N	Y
Costello	Y	Y	Y	N	Nr	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Nr
Ford, L. M.	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Nr	N	Pf	Pa
Johnson				Y	Pa	N	Nr	Y	Y	N
Sheppard	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Y	Y	Y	Y
Izac	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	N	Y
Geyer, 17th District (Calif.), not replaced.										
Colorado:										
Lewis	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y
Hill				N	N	N	N	Y	Nr	Pa
Chenoweth				N	N	N	N	Y	Nr	N
[Vacancy]										

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Connecticut:										
Shanley	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Kopplemann				Y	Y	Y	Nr	Nr	N	Y
Fitzgerald				Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Downs				Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Maciora				Y	Y	N	Pf	Y	N	Y
Delaware:										
Traynor				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Florida:										
Peterson	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Green	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Nr	N	Y	N
Sikes				Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Cannon	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Nr	N	Y	Y
Hendricks	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Nr
Georgia:										
Peterson	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Nr	Y	Y	N
Cox	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Y	Y	N
Pace	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Camp		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Nr	Y	Y
Ramspeck	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Vinson	N	N	Y	Y	Pf	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tarver	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Gibson				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Whelchel	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	N
Brown	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Idaho:										
White	Y	Y	N	N	N	Pa		Pf	Nr	N
Dworshak	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Illinois:										
Mitchell	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Nr	Nr	Y	Y
McKeough	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Kelly	Nr	N	Pf	Y	N	N	Pf	N	N	Nr
Beam	N	N	Y	Y	N	Pa	Y	Nr	N	Y
Sabath	Pa	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Maciejewski	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Nr	N	Y
Schuetz	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Nr	N	Y
Kocialkowski	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	N	Y	Y
Dewey				N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Paddock				N	N	N	Nr	N	Y	N
Reed	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Mason	Pf	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Allen	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Johnson	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Chiperfield	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	N
Dirksen	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	Y
Arends	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Sumner	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
Wheat	Pf	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Barnes	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Y	Y	Y
Howell				N	N	N	Nr	Y	N	N

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Illinois—Continued:										
Schaefer	Y	N	Y	Pf	Nr	Y	Nr	N	Nr	Pf
Arnold	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Pf
Heidinger				N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	N
Bishop				N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Stratton				N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Day				N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Indiana:										
Schulte	Y	N	Pf	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Halleck	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	N	Y	Y
Grant	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Gillie	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Harness	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	N	Y	N
Johnson	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Nr	Y
Landis	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Boehne	Nr	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Pf	N	Nr	Y
Wilson				N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Springer	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Larrabee	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Pf
Ludlow	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Iowa:										
Martin	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	N
Jacobsen	Nr	Y	Y	N	Nr	N	Nr	Y	N	Y
Gwynne	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Talle	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Le Compte	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Pa	N	Y	N
Cunningham				Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Jensen	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Gilchrist	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Harrington	N	Y	Y	N	N	Nr	Y	Y	Y	N
Kansas:										
Lambertson	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Nr	Y	Y	N
Guyer	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	N
Winter	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Rees	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Houston	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Y	Y	N	Y
Carlson	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Hope	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
Kentucky:										
Gregory	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Vincent	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
O'Neal	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y	N
Creal	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Spence	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Chapman	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
May	N	N	Y	Y	Pf	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Bates	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	N	Y
Robsion	Y	Y	Nr	N	N	N	Pa	Y	N	N
Louisiana:										
Hebert				Y	Y	Pf	Y	Y	Y	N
Boggs				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Louisiana—Continued:										
Domengeaux				Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y	Y	Y
Brooks	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mills	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Sanders				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Plauche				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Allen	Y	N	Nr	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maine:										
Oliver	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Smith, M. C.				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fellows				N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Maryland:										
Ward	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Cole	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
D'Alesandro	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Meyer				Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Sasscer	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y
Byron (Mrs.)					Y	Y		Y	N	Y
Massachusetts:										
Treadway	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	Y
Clason	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Casey	Nr	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	N	Pa	Y
Holmes	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Rogers	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Bates	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Healey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Eliot				Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Tinkham	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Flaherty	N	N	Y	Y	Nr	N	Nr	Nr	N	Y
McCormack	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Wigglesworth	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Martin	Pf	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Gifford	Pf	N	N	Y	Y	N	Pa	Y	Y	Y
Michigan:										
Tenerowicz	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Michener	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Shafer	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Hoffman	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	N
Jonkman				N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Blackney	Y	Y	N	N	Pa	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Wolcott	Y	Y	Pa	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Crawford	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Engel	Nr	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Woodruff	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Bradley	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Hook	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
O'Brien				N	N	N	Nr	Y	N	Y
Rabaut	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Pa	Y	Nr	N	N
Dingell	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	N	N	Y
Lesinski	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pa	Y
Dondero	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Minnesota:										
Andresen	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
O'Hara				N	N	Pa	N	Nr	Y	N
Gale				N	N	N	N	Y	Nr	Nr
Maas	N	Y	N	N	N	Nr	N	Nr	Nr	Nr
Youngdahl	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Knutson	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Andersen (Carl)	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	N
Pittenger	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Buckler	Y	N	N	N	N	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	N
Mississippi:										
Rankin	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
*Doxey	N	N	Y	Y		Nr	Y	Nr		
Whitten									Y	N
Whittington	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Ford	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y	Y	N
Collins	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Nr	Nr	Y	N
Colmer	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Pf	Y	Y	Y
McGehee	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Nr	Y	Y	N
Missouri:										
Romjue	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr
Nelson	N	N	Pf	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Duncan	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	N	Y	Y
Bell	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	N	Y	N
Shannon	Nr	Y	Y	N	N	N	Nr	Y	Nr	Nr
Bennett				N	N	N	Pa	Y	Pf	N
Short	Pf	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Williams	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Nr	Y	N	Y
Cannon	Nr	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Zimmerman	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sullivan				Y	Y	Y		N	N	Y
Ploeser				N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	N
Cochran	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Pf	N	N	Y
Montana:										
Rankin				N	N	N	N	Pf	N	N
O'Connor	Y	Y	N	N	N	Pf	Y	Nr	N	N
Nebraska:										
Copeland				N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	N
McLaughlin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Stefan	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Curtis	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Coffee	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Nevada:										
Scrugham	Pa	N	N	Y	Nr	Pf	Y	Y	Nr	Pa
New Hampshire:										
Jenks	Y	Y	Pa	N	N	Nr	Pa	Nr	Y	Y
Stearns	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Pa	Y	Nr	Y

* Resigned. See Senate roll call.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
New Jersey:										
Wolverton	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Wene				Y	Y	Y	Pf	Nr	N	Y
Sutphin	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Af	Y	Nr	N	Y
Powers	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Pa	Y	N	Nr
Eaton	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Pa	Y	Y	Y
McLean	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Thomas	Y	Y	Pa	Y	N	Nr	Pa	Nr	Y	N
Canfield				N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Osmers	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	N	Y	Pa
Hartley	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pf	Y	Pa
Vreeland	Y	N	N	N	Y	Nr	N	Nr	Y	Y
Kean	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Norton	Nr	N	Pf	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Pa	Pf
Hart	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
New Mexico:										
Anderson				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	N
New York:										
Hall, L. W.	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Barry	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Pfeifer, Jos. L.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Nr	N	Y
Cullen	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Heffernan				Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Somers	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Delaney	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Nr	N	Y
O'Toole	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Nr
Keogh	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Pa	N	Y
Celler	N	N	Nr	Nr	Y	Nr	Nr	Nr	N	Nr
O'Leary	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Pf	N	Nr	Nr
Dickstein	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Capozzoli				Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Klein					Y	Y		N	N	Y
Kennedy, Michael	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Nr	N	Y
Pheiffer, Wm.				N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Baldwin					Y	Y	Y	Pa	Nr	Nr
Kennedy, Martin	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Nr	N	Y
Bloom	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	N	N	Y
Marcantonio	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Nr	Nr	N	Y
Gavagan	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Nr	N	Y
Lynch				Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Buckley	N	N	Nr	Y	Y	Y	Pf	N	N	Y
Fitzpatrick	Nr	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	N	N	Y
Gamble	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Fish	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rockefeller	Y	Y	Pa	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Byrne	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Nr	N	Pf
Cluett	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pa	Y	Y	Y
Crowther	Y	Y	Pa	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Kilburn			N	Y	Y	Y	Pa	N	Y	Y

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
New York—Continued:										
Culkin	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Douglas	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Pa	Y	Pf	Nr
Hall, Edwin			N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Hancock	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Nr	Y	Y
Taber	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Cole	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Nr	Nr
O'Brien	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Pa	N	Y	Y
Wadsworth	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Pf
Andrews	Pf	Y	Nr	Y	N	Y	Pa	N	Y	Nr
Beiter				Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	N	Y
Butler					N	N		Y	N	N
Reed	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	N	Y	N
Merritt	N	N	Pf	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
O'Day	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Pa	Pa	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr
North Carolina:										
Bonner				Y	Y	Y	Pf	Y	Y	N
Kerr	Pa	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Barden	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Pf	Y	Y	Y
Cooley	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Folger, J. H.					Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Durham	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Clark	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	N	Y	N
Burgin	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Doughton	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Nr	Y	Y
Bulwinkle	Pa	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Weaver	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
North Dakota:										
Burdick	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Robertson				N	N	N	Nr	Y	Y	N
Ohio:										
Elston	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Hess	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Holbrock				Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Jones	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Clevenger	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Davis				Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Brown	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Smith	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Hunter	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Jenkins	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Claypool	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Vorys	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Baumhart				N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Harter	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Secrest	Y	Y	N	N	Pa	N	Nr	Y	N	Y
Thom				Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
McGregor				N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Imhof				Y	Pf	N	Y	Y	N	Y

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Ohio—Continued:										
Kirwan	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Sweeney	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Nr	Y	N	Y
Crosser	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Bolton	Y			N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	N
Bender	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	Y
Young				Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Oklahoma:										
Disney	Nr	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Nichols	Y	N	Nr	Y	Nr	Y	Pf	Y	Y	N
Cartwright	Nr	N	Y	Y	Nr	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pa
Boren	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Nr	Nr	Y	N
Monroney	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Johnson	N	N	Nr	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Wickersham					Y	Y		Y	Y	N
Rizley				N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	N
Rogers	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y	Nr	Nr
Oregon:										
Mott	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Pierce	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Angell	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Pennsylvania:										
Sacks	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	N	Y
McGranery	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Nr	N	Y
Bradley	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Sheridan			Y	Y	N	N	Nr	Nr	N	Pf
Smith				Y	Y	N	Nr	N	N	Y
Myers	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	N	N	Y
Scott				N	N	Pa	N	Nr	Y	Y
Wolfenden	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Gerlach	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Kinzer	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Boland	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Flannery	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Nr	Pa	Nr
Simpson	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	Y
Fenton	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Nr	Y
Moser	Y	N	Pf	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Gillette										
Rich	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Ditter	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	N
Kunkel	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Jarrett	Y	Y	Pa	Pa	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Walter	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Haines				Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Van Zandt	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Snyder	N	N	Y	Y	Nr	Y	Y	N	Nr	Nr
Faddis	N	N	Y	Y	Pf	Y	Y	N	Y	Nr
Graham	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Tibbott	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Nr	Y

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Pennsylvania—Continued:										
Kelley				Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Rodgers	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Scanlon				Y	N	N	Nr	N	N	Y
Weiss				Y	Y	N	Pf	N	N	Y
Eberharter	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
McArdle	N	N	Y	N	Pa	N	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr
Wright				Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Rhode Island:										
Forand				Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Fogarty				Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
South Carolina:										
Rivers				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr
Fulmer	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Hare	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bryson	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y	Y
Richards	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
McMillan, J. L.	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
South Dakota:										
Mundt	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Case	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Nr	Y	N
Tennessee:										
Reece	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	N
Jennings			N	N	N	N	Pa	Y	Y	Pa
Kefauver		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Gore	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Priest				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Courtney	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Y	Y	Y
Pearson	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y	Y	N
Cooper	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Davis			Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Y	Y	Y
Texas:										
Patman	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dies	Nr	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y	Y	N
Beckworth	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rayburn	N	N	Y	Nr	Nr	Nr		Nr	Nr	Nr
Sumners	Nr	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Nr	Y	Y	Y
Johnson, L. A.	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Patton	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	N
Thomas	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Mansfield	Nr	N	Pf	Nr	Pa	Y	Pf	Y	Y	Pf
Johnson, L. D.	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Poage	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Y	Y	N
Lanham	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Gossett	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kleberg	N	N	Y	Y	Pf	Y	Pf	Y	Y	N
West	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Y	Y	N
Thomason	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Russell				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Worley				Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Texas—Continued:										
Mahon	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kilday	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
South	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Utah:										
Granger				Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y	N	N
Robinson	N	N	Y	Y	N	Nr	Y	Pf	Nr	Y
Vermont:										
Plumley	Pf	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Pa	N	Nr	N
Virginia:										
Bland	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Harris					Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Satterfield	N	N	Y	Y	Nr	Y	Pf	N	Nr	Nr
Drewry	N	N	Pf	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Burch	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Woodrum	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	N	Y	Y
Robertson	N	N	Pf	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Smith	N	Pa	Y	Y	N	Y	Pf	N	Y	N
Flannagan	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pf	Y	N	Y
Washington:										
Magnuson	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Nr	Nr	Pa	Pf
Jackson				N	Y	Pf	Y	Nr	N	Y
Smith	Y	N	N	Y	Pf	N	Nr	Y	N	Y
Hill	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Leavy	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Coffee	N	N	Pa	N	N	Pa	Y	N	N	Y
West Virginia:										
Ramsay				Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Randolph	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y	Y	Y
Edmiston	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y	N	Y
Johnson	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Pf	Y	Y	Y
Kee	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Smith	Nr	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Nr	Y	N	Nr
Wisconsin:										
Smith					N				N	N
Sauthoff				N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Stevenson				N	N	N	N	Y	Nr	N
Wasielewski				Y	Y	Y	Nr	N	Y	Pa
Thill	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Keefe	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Murray	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Johns	Pf	Y	N	N	N	N	Pa	Y	N	N
Hull	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Gehrmann	Y	Y	Pa	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Wyoming:										
McIntyre				Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y

SENATE

Votes of Senators Whose Terms Expire This Year

EXPLANATION OF ROLL CALLS

COLUMN 1.—Vote on continuing the mandatory arms-embargo provisions of the Neutrality Act, October 27, 1939. This amendment was proposed as an attempt to retain the arms-embargo provisions of the Neutrality Act. A "Yes" (Y) vote may be considered an isolationist vote.

COLUMN 2.—Vote on Senate ratification of Reciprocal Trade Agreements, March 29, 1940. Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program for a three-year period was voted by the Seventy-sixth Congress. The roll call on requiring Senate ratification of each of the agreements is chosen as being more indicative of the attitude of members of the Senate toward the program of freer international trade than was the vote on passage of the measure.

COLUMN 3.—Vote on an amendment to the Selective Service Act to limit the use of armed forces of the United States to the Western Hemisphere, March 7, 1941.

COLUMN 4.—Vote on passage of the Lend-Lease Act, March 8, 1941.

COLUMN 5.—Vote on retaining combat zone and belligerent port bans of the Neutrality Act, November 7, 1941.

COLUMN 6.—Vote on passage of the bill to extend military service for an eighteen-month period, August 7, 1941.

COLUMN 7.—Vote on an amendment to the Deficiency and Supplementary Appropriation Bill for National Defense which would have permitted the purchase of farm products by the Army and Navy from outside the United States, March 31, 1941. Defeat of this amendment was considered a blow to friendly relationships with the other American countries.

COLUMN 8.—Vote to override the veto on a defense highways appropriation measure, August 6, 1941. The bill was vetoed on the ground that it called for an unnecessary expenditure of funds. The President had requested an appropriation for defense highways. The bill as passed carried a general federal aid highway appropriation to be divided among the states in the usual way.

COLUMN 9.—Vote on a resolution of the Senate condemning stoppages of work because of labor trouble in defense industries, June 12, 1941.

COLUMN 10—Vote on lowering income tax exemptions from $2,000 to $1,500 for married persons and from $1,000 to $750 for single persons, September 4, 1941.

COLUMN 11—Vote on the O'Mahoney Amendment to the Price Control Bill, January 10, 1942. This amendment gave even greater advantage to farm commodities than was finally included in the Price Control Act.

SENATE ROLL CALLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Alabama:											
BANKHEAD...	N	N	N	Y	N	Pf	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Arkansas:											
SPENCER.....					Pa	Af		Af	Y	Y	Y

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Colorado:											
JOHNSON	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Pa	Y	N	Y	Y
Delaware:											
HUGHES.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Nr	N	Y
Georgia:											
RUSSELL.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Pf	Y	Y	Nr	N	Y
Idaho:											
THOMAS.....		Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Illinois:											
BROOKS.....			Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Iowa:											
HERRING....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Nr	Nr	Y	Y	Y
Kansas:											
CAPPER.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Kentucky:											
CHANDLER...	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Pf	Y	Y	Pf	N
Louisiana:											
ELLENDER...	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Maine:											
WHITE.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y	Y	Nr	Y
Massachusetts:											
LODGE.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Nr	Nr	Y	Pa	N
Michigan:											
BROWN.....	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Pf	Y	N	Nr	N
Minnesota:											
BALL.....			N	Y	N	Pf	N	Nr	Y	Nr	Y
Mississippi:											
DOXEY.....					N						Y
Montana:											
MURRAY.....	N	Y	N	Y	N	Nr	Y	Af	Pa	N	Y
Nebraska:											
NORRIS.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Nr	N	Nr	Y	Nr	N
New Hampshire:											
BRIDGES.....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Pa	Y	Y	Y	Nr
New Jersey:											
SMATHERS....	N	N	N	Y	N	Af	Nr	Y	N	Y	Y
New Mexico:											
HATCH.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Nr	Y	Nr
North Carolina:											
BAILEY.....	N	Pa	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Oklahoma:											
LEE.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Aa	N	Y
Oregon:											
MCNARY....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Pa	Pa	Af	Af	Pa	Y
Rhode Island:											
GREEN.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
South Carolina:											
MAYBANK....					N						Y
South Dakota:											
BULOW.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Pf	Nr	N	Nr	Y	N	Y
Tennessee:											
STEWART....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Af	Y
Texas:											
O'DANIEL....					N	N		Y		Y	Y
Virginia:											
GLASS.....	Aa	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Nr	Y	Y	Nr	Pa
West Virginia:											
ROSIER.....					N	Af		Y	N	N	Y
Wyoming:											
SCHWARTZ....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Nr	Y	Nr	Y	Y

ROUND TABLE SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

Please send the University of Chicago ROUND TABLE for:

☐ One Year ($2.00) ☐ Six Months ($1.00)

Name.....

Address.....

City.....State.....

☐ I am enclosing the correct amount

☐ Please send me a bill

FOREIGN: ONE YEAR, $3.00; SIX MONTHS, $1.50

TRANSCRIPT SUBSCRIPTIONS

ONE YEAR'S SUBSCRIPTION.....$2.00 SIX MONTHS'.....$1.00

FOR SINGLE COPIES OF THE BROADCASTS LISTED BELOW SEND TEN CENTS IN COIN TO THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO ROUND TABLE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. ANY FIVE PAST OR FUTURE BROADCASTS, 25 CENTS.

LISTS

of 1938–40 Transcripts Still in Print Will Be Sent upon Request. Students and Teachers Will Find These Issues To Be Valuable Commentaries upon Events of the Period.

No. **1941**

150. *Can Capitalism Defend America?*
153. *Guns or Butter?*
154. *Dilemma in the Far East*
155. *How To Fight Nazi Propaganda*
156. *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*
157. *Strikes and National Defense*
158. *Defense Economics*
161. *War Aims and Peace Aims*
163. *Lessons from Europe's War*
164. *The Effect of the Blitzkrieg on the Economic Order*
166. *Roosevelt* vs. *Hitler*
169. *War against the Middle Classes?*
170. *The Crisis and Your Pocketbook*
173. *Our Liberties*
174. *Blueprint for Hemisphere Defense*
177. *Defense: Who'll Pay the Piper?*
178. *Japan: Setting Sun?*
179. *National Unity*
180. *Weapons of Economic War*
182. *Crisis of Capitalism*
185. *New Frontiers in Education and Research*
186. *Anti-Semitism*
188. *Economics of Blitzkrieg*
189. *Showdown with Japan?*
190. *Science and War*

No.

191. *Defense Inventory*
192. *The Philippines*
193. *Little Business: What Now?*
194. *Labor's Responsibility in Defense*
195. *Canada: Neighbor at War*
196. *Civil Rights and "Public Danger"*
197. *Manpower: The Key to Victory*
198. *What Does Rationing Mean?*

1942

199. *Morale: Ours and Theirs*
200. *How To Meet the Menace of Inflation*
201. *Censorship*
202. *How United Are the Americas?*
203. *Are We Overconfident?*
204. *Labor Policies in Wartime*
205. *What Should the Churches Do in War?*
206. *What Should We Teach Our Youth Now?*
207. *Propaganda: Good and Bad*
208. *Civilian Defense*
209. *Taxes* vs. *Axis*
210. *Women, Work, and the War*
211. *The American Temper*
212. *India*
213. *Wanted: 30,000,000 Men*
214. *War Profits*
215. *War and the Family.* April 26

All Round Table Transcripts Contain Added Factual Material in the Form of Graphs, Maps, Pictographs, Footnotes, Bibliographies, Etc.

Do You Understand the Economics of War?

You should read: *Defense Inventory* (*191*), *Little Business: What Now?* (*193*), *What Does Rationing Mean?* (*198*), and *How To Meet the Menace of Inflation* (*200*).

Aliens in Our Midst

•

A UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO ROUND TABLE BROADCAST

•

MAY 10, 1942

•

CAREY McWILLIAMS, California Commissioner of Immigration and Housing

LOUIS WIRTH, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago

ERNEST COLWELL, Dean of the Divinity School, University of Chicago

•

SUGGESTED READINGS

BIDDLE, FRANCIS, "Axis Aliens in America," *Survey Graphic,* January, 1942.

———, "Identification of Alien Enemies," *Vital Speeches,* February 15, 1942.

HARRISON, EARL G., "Axis Aliens in an Emergency," *Survey Graphic,* September, 1941.

McWILLIAMS, CAREY, "California and the Japanese," *New Republic,* March 2, 1942.

———, "Japanese Out of California," *New Republic,* April 6, 1942.

[PRINTED IN U·S·A]